



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

32

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/741,251	12/21/2000	Andrew Issac Deitsch	RD-27,606	8203

6147 7590 03/16/2005

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY  
GLOBAL RESEARCH  
PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59  
NISKAYUNA, NY 12309

EXAMINER
----------

DAVIS, ZACHARY A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/741,251		DEITSCH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Zachary A Davis		2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-101 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-101 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                         |                                                                             |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                                |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                             | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. An amendment was received on 15 September 2004. No claims have been amended, added, or canceled. Claims 1-101 are currently pending in the present application.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 15 September 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant traverses the rejection of Claims 1-101 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lloyd et al, US Patent 6219790, and argues that the claims are not anticipated by Lloyd.

Applicant argues that Lloyd does not anticipate the limitation of a gateway device including an authenticator that authenticates the identity of a service provider and a device. However, the Examiner believes that Lloyd does indeed disclose a gateway device that includes an authenticator that authenticates the identity of a device (see column 3, lines 23-30, as previously cited, where the user of a device is authenticated; see also column 5, lines 47-51, where an authentication request also includes device identifying information) and a service provider (see, for example, column 4, lines 15-21, and column 5, lines 5-16).

Applicant argues that Lloyd does not anticipate the limitation of a gateway device that includes an access authorizer that permits a service provider to interact with a device. However, the Examiner believes that Lloyd does indeed disclose an access authorizer that permits interaction between a service provider and a device (column 12, lines 8-15, where authorization is determined based on the presence of a permit, noting column 11, lines 16-23, where the permit determines whether a user is authorized to access a requested service).

Applicant argues that Lloyd does not anticipate the limitation of an activity manager that manages the activities occurring between the service provider and the device. However, the Examiner believes that the cited section of Lloyd, column 13, lines 2-21, does indeed disclose managing activities between the service provider and device. Specifically, information is stored regarding session establishment and termination and time using a service; information and reports regarding many purposes, including but not limited to accounting, are provided.

Applicant argues that Lloyd does not anticipate the limitation of a request handler that receives activity requests from the service provider and the device. However, Applicant also states that the cited portion of Lloyd, column 5, lines 59-64, relates to receiving an authentication request to validate a user request; the Examiner believes that this does indeed constitute receiving an activity request. The Examiner further notes that Lloyd discloses users requesting access to services (column 5, lines 5-6).

Applicant argues that Lloyd does not anticipate the limitation of a data format translator that translates the format of data transmitted and received by the service

provider and the device during activities. However, Applicant also states that the cited portion of Lloyd, column 3, lines 8-9, relates to translation of client requests into an internal format; the Examiner believes that this does indeed constitute translating the format of data. Further, the Examiner notes that Lloyd specifically discloses using an internal standard format for requests and responses (column 6, lines 56-60) and translating incoming requests and outgoing responses between the internal format and various external formats (column 6, line 64-column 7, line 12).

Applicant argues that Lloyd does not anticipate the limitation of a system for securely providing services between a first site and a second site including an appliance in a first network at the first site and a service provider in a second network at the second site. However, the Examiner believes that Lloyd does indeed disclose an appliance in a first network (column 5, lines 38-40; Figure 1, workstation 128) and a service provider in a second network (column 4, lines 15-21; Figure 1, elements 110, 114, 116, for example).

Therefore, for the above reasons, the Examiner maintains the rejection as set forth below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2137

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-101 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lloyd et al, US Patent 6219790.

In reference to Claim 1, Lloyd discloses a gateway device including an authenticator (column 3, lines 23-30; column 4, lines 15-21; column 5, lines 5-16), an access authorizer (column 3, lines 31-34; column 12, lines 8-15, noting column 11, lines 16-23), and an activity manager (column 4, lines 48-50; column 13, lines 2-21).

In reference to Claim 10, Lloyd discloses a gateway device including an authenticator (column 3, lines 23-30; column 4, lines 15-21; column 5, lines 5-16), an access authorizer (column 3, lines 31-34; column 12, lines 8-15, noting column 11, lines 16-23), and an activity manager (column 4, lines 48-50; column 13, lines 2-21).

In reference to Claim 19, Lloyd discloses a gateway device including a request handler (column 5, lines 59-64), an authenticator (column 3, lines 23-30; column 4, lines 15-21; column 5, lines 5-16), an access authorizer (column 3, lines 31-34; column 12, lines 8-15, noting column 11, lines 16-23), an activity manager (column 4, lines 48-50; column 13, lines 2-21), and a response component (column 10, lines 25-29; column 5, lines 29-37).

In reference to Claim 26, Lloyd discloses a gateway device including a request handler (column 5, lines 59-64), an authenticator (column 3, lines 23-30; column 4, lines 15-21; column 5, lines 5-16), an access authorizer (column 3, lines 31-34; column 12,

lines 8-15, noting column 11, lines 16-23), an activity manager (column 4, lines 48-50; column 13, lines 2-21), a data format translator (column 3, lines 8-9; column 6, lines 56-60), and a response component (column 10, lines 25-29; column 5, lines 29-37).

In reference to Claim 27, Lloyd discloses a gateway device including means for authenticating the identities of the service provider and device (column 3, lines 23-30; column 4, lines 15-21; column 5, lines 5-16), means for permitting the service provider to interact with the device (column 3, lines 31-34; column 12, lines 8-15, noting column 11, lines 16-23), and means for managing activities between the service provider and device (column 4, lines 48-50; column 13, lines 2-21).

In reference to Claim 36, Lloyd discloses a system including at least one appliance in a first network (Figure 1, workstation 128; column 5, lines 38-40); a service provider in a second network (Figure 1, elements 110, 114, 116, for example; column 4, lines 15-21); and a gateway device including an authenticator (column 3, lines 23-30; column 4, lines 15-21; column 5, lines 5-16), an access authorizer (column 3, lines 31-34; column 12, lines 8-15, noting column 11, lines 16-23), and a service manager (column 4, lines 48-50; column 13, lines 2-21).

In reference to Claim 45, Lloyd discloses a system including at least one device in a first network (Figure 1, workstation 128; column 5, lines 38-40); a service provider in a second network (Figure 1, elements 110, 114, 116, for example; column 4, lines 15-21); and a gateway device including an authenticator (column 3, lines 23-30; column 4, lines 15-21; column 5, lines 5-16), an access authorizer (column 3, lines 31-34; column

12, lines 8-15, noting column 11, lines 16-23), and an activity manager (column 4, lines 48-50; column 13, lines 2-21).

Claim 54 is directed to a method corresponding substantially to the device of Claim 1, and is rejected by a similar rationale.

Claim 62 is directed to a method corresponding substantially to the device of Claim 10, and is rejected by a similar rationale.

Claim 70 is directed to a method corresponding substantially to the device of Claim 19, and is rejected by a similar rationale.

Claim 76 is directed to a method corresponding substantially to the system of Claim 36, and is rejected by a similar rationale.

Claim 84 is directed to a method corresponding substantially to the system of Claim 45, and is rejected by a similar rationale.

Claim 92 is directed to a software implementation of the device of Claim 1 performing the method of Claim 54, and is rejected by a similar rationale. Further, Lloyd discloses that the device and method may be implemented in hardware, software, or a combination of the two (column 13, lines 22-25).

Claim 100 is directed to a software implementation of the device of Claim 10 performing the method of Claim 62, and is rejected by a similar rationale. Further, Lloyd discloses that the device and method may be implemented in hardware, software, or a combination of the two (column 13, lines 22-25).



Claim 101 is directed to a software implementation of the device of Claim 19 performing the method of Claim 70, and is rejected by a similar rationale. Further, Lloyd discloses that the device and method may be implemented in hardware, software, or a combination of the two (column 13, lines 22-25).

In reference to Claims 2, 11, 20, 28, 37, and 46, Lloyd further discloses a digital signature identifying the gateway device (column 6, lines 26-30).

In reference to Claims 3, 12, 21, 29, 38, 47, 55, 63, 71, 77, 85, and 93, Lloyd further discloses a digital signal verifier (column 6, lines 6-10).

In reference to Claims 4, 13, 22, 30, 39, 48, 56, 64, 72, 78, 86, and 94, Lloyd further discloses a cryptographic component (column 5, lines 52-64).

In reference to Claims 5, 14, 23, 31, 40, 49, 57, 65, 73, 79, 87, and 95, Lloyd further discloses specifying permitted activities (column 6, lines 17-21).

In reference to Claims 6, 15, 32, 41, 50, 58, 66, 80, 88, and 96, Lloyd further discloses a request handler (column 5, lines 59-64).

In reference to Claims 7, 16, 33, 42, 51, 59, 67, 81, 89, and 97, Lloyd further discloses a response component (column 10, lines 25-29; column 5, lines 29-37).

In reference to Claims 8, 17, 24, 34, 43, 52, 60, 68, 74, 82, 90, and 98, Lloyd further discloses a data format translator (column 3, lines 8-9; column 6, lines 56-60).

In reference to Claims 9, 18, 25, 35, 44, 53, 61, 69, 75, 83, 91, and 99, Lloyd further discloses a network protocol translator (column 2, lines 58-67).

***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zachary A Davis whose telephone number is (571) 272-3870. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 8:30-6:00, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

~~2AD~~  
zad



ANDREW CALDWELL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER